DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 643 UD 020 634

AUTHOR Murphy, Hardy Ray
TITLE District and Community Characteristics Influencing Desegregation Strategy Choice and Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 26p.: Tables may be marginally legible due to small print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Community Attitudes; Community Size; *Demography; *Desegregation Effects; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; *Minority Group Influences; Minority Groups; *School Community Relationship; *School Desegregation; Surveys

ABSTRACT

The study described in this paper investigated the relationships between school district and community demographic characteristics, choice of school desegregation strategy, and strategy effectiveness. Respondents from 132 school districts in the Southwestern United States were asked to fill out a questionnaire concerning district and community demography and the choice and effectiveness of strategies used by their communities to desegregate the public schools. Desegregation goal areas examined in the questionnaire included: (1) student and/or faculty racial balancing; (2) promotion of community involvement; (3) crisis prevention and resolution; (4) multicultural/multiethnic curriculum; (5) compensatory education; (6) positive race relations; (7) staff development; and (8) administrative procedures. Initial findings indicate the existence of significant relationships between characteristics such as the attitudes of district and community leaders toward desegregation, community attitudes, teacher ethnicity, student ethnicity, and strategy choice and effectiveness. Based on the findings, it is suggested that desegregating districts should take into account differences in culture, historical desegregation issues, and community attitudes toward the particular minority groups of concern. (Author/GC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED194643

# District and Community Characteristics Influencing Desegregation Strategy Choice and Effectiveness

Hardy Ray Murphy, Ph.D.

Psychological Services
Fort Worth Independent School District
Fort Worth, Texas

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hardy Ray Murphy Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 020 634

Abstract

Accounting for unique district and community characteristics in desegregation planning is becoming more important to the effectiveness with which desegregation is accomplished. This study investigated the relationships between several district and community demographic characteristics, choice of desegregation strategy and strategy effectiveness. Respondents from 132 school districts in the Southwestern area of the United States were asked to fill out a questionnaire concerning district and community demography and the choice and effectiveness of strategies used by their districts to desegregate. Initial findings indicate the existence of significant relationships between characteristics such as the stance of district and community leaders toward desegregation, community attitudes, teacher ethnicity, student ethnicity, and strategy choice and effectiveness. A discussion of the most unique and meaningful relationships is presented.

## Introduction

It is certain that desegregation is a complex phenomenon influenced by a myriad of district and community variables. The source of pressures for a community to desegregate has received extensive investigation (Weinberg, 1977; Pettigrew, 1973; Armor and Coleman, 1966). Local pressures, activities by school officials, state boards of education, local civil rights groups, and other locally initiated activities urging desegregation are received differently by communities than pressures from external sources such as HEW investigations and the threat of fund withdrawals, and court pressures brought about by suits initiated by local citizens groups. Similarly, the public stance of local school officials and community leaders also influences community reaction and cooperation relative to desegregation efforts (Crain, 1968; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976).

Just as district and community reactions vary with the source of desegregation pressures, the strategies chosen by districts in desegregation efforts and their effectiveness also interact with the unique political and demographic characteristics of individual communities and districts. Effective school and community planning has been documented in the literature as a prerequisite to successful desegregation. Districts utilizing the results of district and community planning committees appear to desegregate with greater ease and less community and staff resentment than districts which establish an arbitrary method of desegregation (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976). Knowing the relationships between district and community political, social, and demographic characteristics, the type of desegregation strategies chosen and their effectiveness in promoting desegregation would provide valuable information for future desegregation efforts.

## Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether or not there exist significant relationships between district and community demographic variables and strategy choice and effectiveness which would provide directions for future research to aid in desegregation planning and implementation.

## Method

Sample. The sample in this study consisted of 132 school districts in six Southwestern states: Arkansas - 11; Louisiana - 18; Mississippi - 10; New Mexico - 11; Oklahaoma - 7; Texas - 65. The total number of districts participating represented more than 63% of the districts in this six-state area.

Instrumentation. The instrument used for this investigation was a combination open ended and closed response questionnaire designed to collect information concerning use and effectiveness of 90 desegregation strategies in eight desegregation goal areas, information concerning district and community demographic data, information concerning respondent biographical data, and information concerning problems and areas of needs which remain to be resolved in the districts surveyed. For this paper, data concerning strategy use and effectiveness and district/community demographic characteristics were analyzed.

The eight desegregation goal areas included: I - Student and/or Faculty Racial Balancing; II - Promoting Community Involvement; III - Crisis Prevention/Resolution; IV - Multicultural/Multiethnic Curriculum; V - Compensatory Education; VI - Positive Race Relations; VII - Staff Development; VIII - Administrative Procedures. The eight goal areas covered a total of 90 strategies identified in an in-depth survey of the desegregation literature.

The district/community demographic data analyzed in this paper were divided into the following categories: I - Public Stance of District/Community Leaders; II - Community Attitudes; III - Sources of Desegregation Pressures; IV - Student Ethnicity; V - Teacher Ethnicity. A complete list of the desegregation strategies and district/community demographic variables is included in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Procedures. District superintendents in the six-state region served by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory were contacted and asked to participate in the project WIEDS (Ways of Improving Education in Desegregated Schools) survey. Superintendents from 209 school districts were mailed a copy of the survey instrument to be completed by themselves or someone in their district's central office who had an integral role in the district's desegregation process. Respondents were to indicate whether or not their district had used a particular strategy and indicate the strategy's effectiveness on a five-point scale ranging from negative effect to positive effect. They were also asked to indicate their district's and community's demographic characteristics in a similar manner. As noted above, 132 of the surveyed districts completed and returned the questionnaire.

Data analyses. Questionnaire responses were analyzed in the following manner:

1. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed for frequency of strategy usage and values of demographic indicators to determine if significant relationships between strategy usage and district/community demography existed.

2. The top twenty most effective strategies were identified by determining the frequency with which respondents gave a strategy the highest rating.

3. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed for the effectiveness ratings of the top twenty desegregation strategies and values of demographic indicators to determine if significant relationships existed between strategy effectiveness and demography.

Results

Demographic Characteristics/Strategy Usage. Table 2 presents a frequency of the significant relationships and serves to illustrate the trends to be discussed. Table 3 shows the correlations between the variables in each demographic category and the frequency of usage of strategies in each desegregation goal area which reached significance at the .05 level. Positive signs indicate a positive relationship between variables and

---

Insert Tables 2 & 3 about here

---

negative signs indicate a negative relationship between variables. As the tables show, there were a large number of significant relationships. What were felt to be some of the more meaningful findings are reported in this section.

Public Stance of District/Community Leaders

Many more significant associations with strategy usage occurred for the public stance of district administrators and school boards toward desegregation than for the public stance of non education affiliated community leaders. There were more significant relationships between strategy usage and the public stance toward desegregation for school board and central office administrators than for the stance of second line administrators (principals) and instructional staff.

There is an interesting distinction in the types of significant strategy usage relationships between principals and instructional staff. The desegregation stance of principals appears to be related to community involvement and the usage of administrative types of strategies such as strategies #14, 18, 23 and 24 and 86, 87 and 88 in goal areas II and VIII when considering the frequency of significant relationships by goal area. The desegregation stance of instructional leaders is significantly related

to the use of several classroom and compensatory education techniques, strategies #37, 38 and 46 in goal area V.

Another interesting finding was that many of the desegregation strategies significantly related to the stance of political leaders were negative. Indicative of these relationships, as Table 2 shows, increased liaison efforts (strategy #26) to prevent or resolve crisis situations were associated with less favorable attitudes toward desegregation of political leaders. Also, more staff development training in race stereotyping behaviors and attitudes (strategy #74) was associated with less favorable attitudes toward desegregation of political leaders, as was the hiring of desegregation specialists (strategy #85) to arbitrate and plan desegregation efforts.

Community Attitudes Toward Desegregation

As with the public stance of district and community leaders, there were several significant relationships between community attitudes toward desegregation and strategy usage. Several negative associations worth mentioning occurred. Notably, there was a significant negative relationship between anglo attitudes toward desegregation and the use of strategies to increase district liaison or contact with law enforcement officials (strategy #26). In goal area IV, Multiethnic/Multicultural Curriculum, there were several significant negative associations between community attitudes and strategy usage (strategy #30, 32, 34 multicultural bulletin boards, celebrating ethnic holidays, increasing bilingual staff). In goal area V, Compensatory Education, the use of techniques to eliminate pupil competition and promote cooperation (strategy #44) is negatively associated with anglo community attitudes. Another interesting finding in the analysis of this demographic category was that the attitudes of the Hispanic community were significantly related to usage for more strategies than either the attitudes of the anglo or the black communities.

Sources of Desegregation Pressures

Appreciably more significant strategy usage relationships occurred with the pressures to desegregate brought about by civil rights groups, local education agencies,

and court action in this demographic category than with office of education, office of civil rights, and state education office pressures. Increased pressures by civil rights groups, local education agencies, and the courts were significantly associated with the use of strategies to increase liaison with law enforcement officials, the establishment of a crisis hot line, and forming crisis intervention teams (strategy #27 and 28) in goal area III, Crisis Prevention/Resolution. There were more significant relationships with strategy usage and LEA pressures in goal areas V, VI, VII, Compensatory Education, Race Relations, and Staff development. Civil rights pressures were significantly related to more strategies in goal areas I, V, VI and VII, Student/Faculty Racial Balancing, Compensatory Education, Race Relations, and Staff Development. The most significant strategy usage relationships for court pressures occurred in goal areas I and V, Student/Faculty Racial Balancing and Compensatory Education.

Student Ethnicity

Student ethnicity was significantly related to strategy usage for many strategies in goal areas V, VI, and VII, which were concerned with staff development (strategy #68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80), compensatory education (strategy #36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47), and promoting staff/student relations (strategy #50, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 65). Also, there were more significant strategy use relationships for the percentage of black students in a district and community than for the percentage of anglo or Hispanic students. All but one of the significant associations between the percentage of anglo students and strategy use were negative. For example, an increase in the percentage of anglo students in a district was significantly associated with hiring fewer minority staff, and utilizing fewer compensatory education strategies. A higher percentage of anglo students was significantly associated with fewer activities to promote race relations such as the elimination of ability grouping, utilizing fewer desegregation related staff development activities such as training in bilingualism, ethnic and cultural behaviors, disciplinary skills training, and classroom management

training. The only significant positive relationship between percentages of anglo students and strategy use was with the tendency of districts surveyed to close schools for desegregation purposes (strategy #9). Districts with the largest percentages of anglo students were more likely to close schools to facilitate desegregation than districts with lower percentages of anglo students.

An increase in minority student percentages was significantly associated with teacher reassignment, district rezoning and student transfers in order to achieve racial balancing (strategy #2, 3, 11). An increase in the percentage of black students was associated with an increase in law enforcement liaison efforts (strategy #26); however, the reverse is true for an increase in the percentage of Hispanic students in the school districts surveyed. As expected, an increase in the percentage of Hispanic students is associated with increased efforts in the area of bilingualism (strategy #34, 46, 75, 88). Also increases in the percentage of minority students, in general, were also significantly associated with the hiring of more teachers' aides (strategy #36) the utilization of resource people for staff development (strategy #80), and the modification of district discipline policies (strategy #89).

Teacher Ethnicity

Some of the more interesting relationships in this category were in goal areas I, V and VI, concerned with Student/Faculty Racial Balancing, Compensatory Education, and Staff Development (strategy #41, 46, 52, 54, 55, 56, 65). Higher percentages of minority teachers in the districts surveyed were associated with teacher reassignments, educational parks, student transfers, law enforcement liaison, crisis intervention teams, hiring more teachers' aides, vocational guidance, elimination of ability grouping, minority participation in accelerated classes, soliciting ESAA funds, and using parents as classroom resources. Similar to the results for student ethnicity, the greatest number of significant strategy usage relationships in this category, occurred for the percentage of black teachers in school districts surveyed.

There were differences in the significant associations for strategy usage between the percentages of black and Hispanic teachers in terms of strategies concerned with bilingualism as might be expected. However, varying relationships between these two groups of staff were found in other areas also. The percentage of Hispanic teachers was negatively associated with district rezoning, whereas the percentage of black teachers was positively related to district rezoning. The same pattern of significant associations occurred in examining the relationship between the percentages of black staff, Hispanic staff, and the establishment of liaison efforts with law enforcement officials, the solicitation of staff input while desegregating and, also, the utilization of outside resource people for staff development. Yet, training staff in the use of multiethnic materials was negatively related to the percentage of black teachers in a district but positively related to the percentage of Hispanic teachers.

Results:

Demographic Characteristics/Strategy Effectiveness. Table 4 shows the significant correlations between demographic variables and effectiveness ratings for the twenty strategies most frequently receiving the highest effectiveness ratings.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

As the table shows, no strategies from goal areas I and III, Student/Faculty Racial Balancing and Crisis Prevention/Resolution, were among those most frequently rated as effective. Three strategies from goal area II were in this group. One strategy, Multicultural Curriculum, was included in this list. Three of the twenty strategies most consistently receiving the highest effectiveness ratings were from goal area V, Compensatory Education. There are three strategies in the list from goal area VI, Race Relations. One strategy from goal area VII, Staff Development, and five strategies from goal area VIII, Administrative Procedures, are included.

Public Stance of District/Community Leaders

Table #4 also shows that significant relationships occurred between the public stance of district and community leaders, category V, and the effectiveness of several strategies (strategy #20, 25, 34, 36, 37, 38, 44, 56, 57, 71, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89). Within this category, as with the relationships with strategy usage reported earlier, the stance of the school board and central office staff are significantly associated with strategy effectiveness most often. Also, from these results, it appears that, as reported in the previous section, the stance of instructional staff is related moreso to the effectiveness of compensatory education related strategies and other classroom related strategies (strategy #26, 37, 38, 56, 57, 83, 86, 89) than strategies designed for administrative or other purposes. The public stance of political leaders was significantly related to strategy effectiveness for more strategies (strategy #25, 34, 36, 37, 44, 86, 89) than the stance of religious (strategy #37, 38, 71) or business leaders (strategy #34).

Sources of Desegregation Pressures

Within this category, the most significant strategy effectiveness rating associations occurred for pressures by local education agencies, (strategy #24, 34, 36, 37, 56, 58) followed by court pressures (strategy #25, 34, 71, 86) and pressures by civil rights groups (strategy #24, 25, 86). Only one significant association occurred between state education agency pressure and strategy effectiveness ratings (strategy #36), and no significant associations occurred for He alth, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, or Office of Civil Rights pressures.

Community Attitudes Toward Desegregation

The number of significant associations with ratings of strategy effectiveness were fairly evenly distributed in this category: anglo 4 (strategy #25, 36, 37, 88) black 2 (strategy #37, 71), Hispanic 3 (strategy #25, 48, 57). Half of these associations were negative. Negative attitudes of the black community in districts and

and communities surveyed were associated with more effective ratings of communications skills training in staff development. Using more teachers' aides and reducing the teacher/pupil ratio was rated effectively for negative black and anglo attitudes also. On the other hand, positive attitudes of the Hispanic community were significantly related to higher effectiveness ratings for the use of parental volunteers in the desegregation process.

## Teacher Ethnicity

The number of significant associations with strategy effectiveness in this category were evenly distributed among anglo teacher percentages (strategy #20, 24, 25, 38, 89), black teacher percentages (strategy #37, 48, 56), and Hispanic teacher percentages (strategy #20, 36, 38). Seven of the nine correlations were negative. The smaller the percentage of black teachers in the surveyed districts, the more effective were strategies to increase minority participation in extra-curricular activities, faculty student contact, and reduce the teacher/pupil ratio. Smaller percentages of anglo teachers were associated with higher effectiveness ratings for the use of community liaison workers, vocational education, parents as volunteers, and the modification of discipline policies and procedures.

## Student Ethnicity

Similar to teacher ethnicity, the significant associations between student ethnic percentages and ratings of strategy effectiveness were evenly distributed among the percentage of anglos(strategy #38), $\text{blacks}_S$(strategy #48, 56, 57) and $\text{Hispanics}_S$(strategy #20, 38, 56, 57). Half of these associations were negative and illustrated some interesting strategy effectiveness relationships across student ethnic categories. The effectiveness of increasing minority participation in extra-curricular activities was negatively associated with the percentage of black students in the districts surveyed, but positively associated with the percentage of Hispanic students. Similarly, the effectiveness of increasing minority participation in student government was

negatively associated with the percentages of black students but positively associated with the percentage of Hispanic students. These associations highlight a recurring theme in the survey results of apparent differences in significant usage and effectiveness relationships concerning these two minority groups in the districts and communities surveyed.

## Discussion

The significant relationships occurring in the data analyses results suggested several themes which link together district/community demographic characteristics, strategy utilization, and perceptions of strategy effectiveness. The themes do not represent the direct power of any specific demographic or historical variable on the outcomes of desegregation. They do indicate that for the desegregation strategies identified, there are identifiable antecedents. These demographic antecedents then influence the desegregation process by effecting strategy choice and effectiveness.

The fact that there are any significant relationships at all indicates that there may be some fairly typical or stereotypical processes occurring in desegregation. Given the uniqueness of individual communities, the desirability of stereotypical desegregation procedures is questionable. A lack of significant relationships may be a more desirable state of affairs, indicating that the desegregation process is community and district specific and implying a more flexible process.

As documented in the desegregation literature, several significant relationships between strategy use and effectiveness and the support of school boards and district central offices occurred in this survey. It is, also, of interest to note that the support of district instructional staff and principals was significantly related to the successful implementation of some strategies but not significantly related to strategy choices. The solicitation and utilization of instructional staff input in planning and implementation is the obvious implication of these results.

Significant negative relationships between crisis prevention strategies and strategies utilized to reduce tension and conflict and the public stance of community

leaders in desegregating communities also have a plausible explanation. The stance of community political leaders reflects the attitudes of the larger community. Political leaders stances also serve as guides for community attitudes and reactions. This being the case, communities experiencing desegregation conflict, or having the potential for conflict, utilize more crisis prevention/resolution techniques.

The results of the analysis of community attitudes toward desegregation and strategy use and effectiveness corroborate these conclusions. Negative community attitudes were related to the use of certain strategies designed to ease tension, lessen conflict and improve inter-ethnic relations in general, in the community and the schools. It is encouraging to note that communities experiencing conflict and tension, also, felt that the strategies significantly associated with conflict or tension were successful.

There was, also, an indication that an investigation of differences in inter-ethnic cooperation in desegregating communities may shed an interesting light on the desegregation process. The frequency of positive significant relationships between Hispanic community attitudes and strategy choices outnumbered those significantly related to black and anglo community attitudes by 3 to 1 and 2 to 1 ratios respectively. This discrepancy was not completely attributable to the existence of ethnic specific strategies related to bilingualism. Many of these strategies were related to voluntary cooperative activities such as using parents as supervisors on school buses and utilizing parents as school employees. The issue of concern here is parental motivation. Parents may take an active part in the process out of fear for their children's safety. The extent to which parents take an active part will be regulated by the desire for desegregation to occur and to the extent that the community at large creates an atmosphere of total participation. The results indicate that in many instances this occurred in the Hispanic community.

The relatively greater number of significant strategy usage associations with civil rights groups' pressures, pressures from local education agencies, and court

pressures is consistent for the most part with the history of desegregation in this country. Desegregation often results from court orders caused by civil rights pressure.

The relatively smaller number of significant strategy usage relationships with the Office of Civil Rights and the Office of Education is probably a reflection of the way desegregation pressure is experienced and perceived rather than an absence of influence from these agencies. While they may play a role in a desegregation suit, it is the relationship between the court and civil rights groups which results in initial mandates to desegregate. On the other hand, the smaller number of significant strategy usage relationships with State Office of Education pressures may be an indication that state governments, for political or financial reasons, play a less significant role in the desegregation process. This is not a unique conclusion. A questional naturally evolving from this speculation is the possibility that desegregation may be accomplished more effectively should state agencies, with their powers of certification and the like, assume leadership roles in the desegregation process.

As mentioned earlier, the results also showed unexpected variations across minority groups in the significant relationships concerning strategy usage and effectiveness. The analysis of teacher and student ethnicity and strategy usage and effectiveness clarifies this point. There were, in the results, significant negative relationships between the percentage of anglo students and the use of particular strategies such as hiring minority staff, utilizing compensatory education strategies, and activities designed to improve inter-ethnic relations within schools. A relationship between student ethnic ratios and ethnic population ratios in communities and the extent of desegregation efforts is implied.

Significant relationships of strategy usage with increases in the number of minority teachers in districts surveyed also supports this conclusion. If true, these relationships between school/community population characteristics and strategy choice and effectiveness offer an interesting insight into the desegregation process. From a

moral and legalistic point of view, minority student percentages and the percentage of minority citizens in a community should not influence desegregation efforts in the areas of staff training and education concerning attitudes, community relations, modification of district policy, and learning differences among students with different ethnic backgrounds. One minority student deserves as much consideration as one hundred. A question posed by the results is whether districts are more motivated to desegregate if there are large numbers of minorities in the school and community than if there are relatively fewer numbers. If this is true, the cause is most likely a system of complex interrelationships between inter-ethnic community attitudes, ethnic group percentages and the degree of desegregation pressures experienced by a district and community.

The variations in significant relationships across ethnic groups for the same, or similar strategies regarding use and effectiveness draws this relationship into sharper focus and pose interesting questions concerning differences in attitudes and relations between the various ethnic groups. It would be of inestimable value to understanding the desegregation process if the reasons why increases in the percentages of black students in the districts surveyed were associated with an increase in law enforcement liaison efforts and crisis prevention/resolution strategies while the reverse was true for Hispanic students. Similarly, the significant negative relationships of black student percentages with ratings of the effectiveness of strategies to increase minority student participation in extra-curricular activities and student government which were positively related to the percentage of Hispanic students appears, at first glance, to be paradoxical.

Variations across ethnic groups of teachers and the significant relationships for the same, or similar, strategies pose similar questions. The question of why black teacher percentages are positively related to the use of liaison efforts with law enforcement agencies, whereas the percentage of Hispanic teachers is negatively

related to these strategies is an example. These relationships also tended to hold up in the strategy effectiveness ratings.

A conclusion which might be drawn from these trends is that desegregating districts should take into account differences in culture, historical desegregation issues, and community attitudes toward the particular minority groups of concern. There is a possibility that the ethnic groups involved in a desegregation issue view each other differently, e.g., anglos view blacks differently than Hispanics, and so on. These differences possibly will reflect variations in attitudes and behavior which should be taken into account during the desegregation process.

In reviewing the overall results of this study, and its implications, it is important to note limitations to the data interpretations. The type of statistic employed prevents cause and effect relationships from being stated here. The fact that questionnaire responses represented the perceptions of one district official, questions the validity of the responses and the resulting data analyses. Because questionnaire strategies were not defined, it is possible that many respondents had different strategies in mind when responding to each item. For instance, an extra-curricular activity could either be participation of minority groups in school athletics or joining the Spanish Club. The nature of these extra-curricular activities would also affect the participation of the various minority groups in a school district differently; and, therefore, have an influence on their perceived effectiveness. Historically, the participation of blacks in school athletics has been an expected phenomenon of school desegregation. However, the black community has become more dissatisfied with this occurring at the expense of academic excellence. On the other hand, it is also possible that participation in the school Spanish Club will be one effect of bilingualism.

Also, it is likely that many of the relationships are spurious in nature. Hiring more bilingual staff would almost certainly be an outgrowth of bilingual programming.

The number of strategy associations with civil rights pressures might also be similar to the associations with court pressures which are often an outgrowth of civil rights litigation.

Finally, it will be noted that not all of the significant relations shown in Tables 3 and 4 were discussed due to the large number which occurred. However, it is felt that the significant themes which surfaced were addressed.

References

Armor, D. The evidence on busing. Public Interest, 1972, 28, 90-126.

Coleman, J. S. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.

Crain, R. Community structure and community decision making. In: The politics of school desegregation. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine, 1968.

Pettigrew, T., Smith, M., Useem, E., and Normand, C. Busing: A review of the evidence. Public Interest, 1973, 30.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the law. Washington, D.C.: 1976.

Weinberg, M. Minority students: A research appraisal. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

TABLE 1

DESEGREGATION STRATEGIES BY GOAL AREA

I - Student/Faculty Racial Balancing

1. Minority staff
2. Teacher reassignments
3. Zone changes
4. School pairings
5. Magnet schools
6. Grade reorganizing
7. Open enrollment
8. New schools
9. School closings
10. Educational parks
11. Student transfers
12. Metropolitan coop.

II - Promoting Community Involvement

13. Information center
14. Liaison groups
15. Rumor control hotline
16. Parent bus rides
17. Media advertisement
18. Written information
19. Public forums
20. Community workers (liaison)
21. Parent human relations training
22. Community centers
23. Parents/school socials
24. Parents/school employees
25. Parent volunteers

III - Crisis Prevention/Resolution

26. Law enforcement liaison
27. Crisis hotline
28. Crisis intervention team

IV - Multicultural/multiethnic Curriculum

29. Multicultural materials
30. Bulletin board (multi)
31. Ethnic activities center
32. Ethnic holidays
33. More minority staff
34. Increase bilingual staff

V - Compensatory Education

35. Peer tutors
36. More Teachers' aides
37. Reduce teacher/pupil ratio
38. Vocational training programs
39. After school/minority underachievers
40. GED counseling
41. Homebound instruction
42. Parents as class resources
43. Community resources

V - (continued)

44. Eliminate competition
45. Early arrival/minority underachievers
46. Bilingual education
47. Promoting social adjustment

VI - Positive Race Relations

48. Student/faculty work contact
49. Student/faculty social contact
50. Racial balances/classes
51. Inter-ethnic pairing/pupils
52. Eliminate ability grouping
53. Individualized instruction
54. Open classes
55. Accelerated classes-minorities
56. Minorities/extracurricular act.
57. Minorities/student government
58. Field trips
59. Team teaching
60. Human relations/students
61. Inter-ethnic socials
62. New/old student orientation
63. Non-graded instruction
64. Student information/desegregation
65. Student discussions/desegregation

VII - Staff Development

66. Reality therapy
67. Values clarification
68. Leadership effectiveness
69. Teaching effectiveness
70. Multi-ethnic materials
71. Communication skills
72. Desegregation information training
73. Linguistic patterns
74. Ethnic/cultural behaviors
75. Bilingual materials
76. Soliciting staff input/desegregation
77. Behavior Modification
78. Classroom management
79. Discipline skills
80. Input from resource people
81. Race stereotyping

VIII - Administrative Procedures

82. ESAA funds
83. Upgrading facilities
84. Enlarge counseling services
85. Desegregation specialists
86. Extracurricular activities
87. Multicultural materials
88. Bilingual teachers
89. Modify discipline policies
90. Upgrade student services

TABLE 1 (continued)

DISTRICT/COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

I - Public Stance of District/Community Leaders

Business leaders' stance toward desegregation
Religious leaders' stance toward desegregation
Political leaders' stance toward desegregation
School board stance toward desegregation
Principals' stance toward desegregation
Central office stance toward desegregation
Instructional leaders' stance toward desegregation

II - Community Attitudes

Anglo community attitudes
Black community attitudes
Hispanic community attitudes

III - Sources of Desegregation Pressure

State Office of Education pressure
U. S. Office of Education pressure
Office of Civil Rights pressure
Civil rights groups pressure
Local education agency pressure
Court pressure

IV - Student Ethnicity

Anglo student percentage
Black student percentage
Hispanic student percentage

V - Teacher Ethnicity

Anglo teacher percentage
Black teacher percentage
Hispanic teacher percentage

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF SIGNIFICANT STRATEGY USE

DEMOGRAPHIC RELATIONSHIPS

| Demographic Characteristics | Desegregation Goal Areas | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | | |
| Community Leaders | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 9 | |
| Religious | | 2 | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | |
| Political | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | |
| School Board | 3 | 3 | | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 23 | |
| Principals | | 4 | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | |
| Central Office Staff | | 4 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 | |
| Instructional Staff | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | $\bar{X}$ = 11 |
| Community Attitudes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 14 | |
| Black | | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | |
| Hispanic | 3 | 2 | | 3 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 28 | $\bar{X}$ = 16.6 |
| Pressure | | | | | | | | | | |
| State Education | 1 | 4 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | |
| Office of Education | 2 | 1 | | | | | 2 | 1 | 6 | |
| Office of Civil Rights | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 6 | | 1 | 12 | |
| Civil Rights Groups | 6 | 4 | 2 | | 4 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 32 | |
| LEA | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 7 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 26 | |
| Courts | 6 | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 21 | $\bar{X}$ = 18.5 |
| Student Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | 1 | | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 15 | |
| Black | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 26 | |
| Hispanic | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 4 | | | | 9 | $\bar{X}$ = 16.6 |
| Teacher Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 | | | 4 | |
| Black | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 19 | |
| Hispanic | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 14 | $\bar{X}$ = 12.3 |
| | 41 | 35 | 14 | 19 | 65 | 60 | 67 | 34 | | |
| | $\bar{X}$=1.8 | $\bar{X}$=1.5 | $\bar{X}$=.63 | $\bar{X}$=.86 | $\bar{X}$-2.9 | $\bar{X}$-2.7 | $\bar{X}$=3 | $\bar{X}$-1.5 | | |

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHY/STRATEGY USE

| Demographic Characteristics | Desegration Goal Areas | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| Community Leaders | | | | | | | | |
| Business | +10 | +16, +28 | +26 | | +46 | -48,+54 | | -82, +88 |
| Religious | | +16, +15 | | | +37,+43,+46 | +54 | +71,+73,+75 | +84 |
| Political | +8 | | -26 | | +46 | -48 | +75,-81 | -85, +88 |
| School Board | -6,+8,-11 | +16,+23,+24 | | +32,+34 | +38,+40,+41 +44,+46 | +54,+55,+64 | +67,+70,+71 +75,+78 | +84, +86 |
| Principals | | +14,+18,+23 +24 | | | +38,+44 | +54 | +67,+71 | +86,+87,+88 |
| Central Office Staff | | +16,+18,+23 +24 | | +34 | +39,+46 | +51,+54,+60 | +67,+70,+75 | +86,+88 |
| Instructional Staff | -6,-11 | +23,+24 | | -30 | +37,+38,+46 | +54 | +70 | +88 |
| Community Attitudes | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | -2,-11 | | -26 | +30,-32 | -35,-36,-44 -46 | -48,-52,-58 | +75 | -82 |
| Black | | | | -32,-34 | -46 | +60,+65 | -75 | -82,-88 |
| Hispanic | +1,+8,+10 | +16,+24 | | +31,+33,+34 | -35,+37,+38 +39,+42,+43 +46 | +49,+52,+54 +49,+62 | +70,+71,+73 +74,+75,+79 +81 | +87 |
| Pressure | | | | | | | | |
| State Education | +12 | +17,+22,+23 +24 | | | +38 | +51,+52 | +66,+67 | +82 |
| Office of Education | +2,+3 | +17 | | | | | +76,+80 | +83 |
| Office of Civil Rights | +2 | +21 | | | +36,+37,+42 | +49,+57,+58 +59,+60,+64 | | +83 |
| Civil Rights Groups | +2,+3,+4, +5,+6,+11 | +17,+19,+20 +21 | +26,+28 | | +35,+30.+40 +44 | +52,+57,+58 +60,+62,+63 +65 | +66,+68,+71 +77,+78,+79 +81 | +83,+84 |
| LEA | +8 | +17,+19,+20 +21 | +26,+28 | | +36,+40,+43 +45, | +52,+54,+59 +62,+63,+65 | +68,+75,+77 +78,+79,+81 | +88, +89 |
| Courts | +2,+3,+4 +5,+9,+11 | +20,+21 | +26,+27,+28 | | +36 | +48,-52,-55 +63 | +68,+76,+79 | +89,+90 |
| Student Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | +9 | | | -33 | -39,-41,-42 -46 | -52,-55,-58 | -68,-73,-75 -78,-79 | -88 |
| Black | +2,+3,+7 +11 | | +26 | -34 | +36,+38,+43 +44,+46 | +50,+55,+56 +57,+65 | -70,-73,-74 -75,-76,-80 | -88,+90.+82 +83 |
| Hispanic | -2 | | -26 | +31,+33,+34 | +36,+42,+46 -47 | | | |
| Teacher Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | +9 | | | | -41 | -55,+65 | | |
| Black | +2,+3,+6 +11 | | +26,+28 | -34 | +36,+38,-46 | +52,+56 | -67,-70,-74 -75,+76,+80 | +82,-88 |
| Hispanic | -9 | | -26 | +33,+34 | +39,+41,+46 | +54 | +66,+70,+75 -76,-80 | +88 |

TABLE 4

DEMOGRAPHY/EFFECTIVENESS

| Demography | Desegregation Goal Areas | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| Community Leaders | | | | | | | | |
| Business | | | | -34 | | | | |
| Religious | | | | | +37, +38 | | +71 | |
| Political | | +25 | | -34 | +36, +37 | +48 | | +86, +89 |
| School Board | | | | | +36, +38 | +48,+56,+57 | +71 | +83,+84,+88 +89 |
| Principals | | +20 | | | +37, +38 | +56 | | +83 |
| Central Office Staff | | +20,+25 | | | +38 | +56,+57 | | +83,+84,+89 |
| Instructional Staff | | | | | +36,+37,+38 | +56,+57 | | +83,+86,+89 |
| Community Attitudes | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | | +25 | | | -36,-37 | | | -88 |
| Black | | | | | -37 | | -71 | |
| Hispanic | | +25 | | | | +48,+57 | | |
| Pressures | | | | | | | | |
| State Education | | | | | +36 | | | |
| Office of Education | | | | | | | | |
| Office of Civil Rights | | | | | | | | |
| Civil Rights Groups | | +24,+25 | | | | | | -86 |
| LEA | | +24 | | +34 | +36,+37 | +56 | | +88 |
| Courts | | +25 | | +34 | | | -71 | -86 |
| Student Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | | | | | -38 | | | |
| Black | | | | | | -48,+56,-57 | | |
| Hispanic | | +20 | | | +38 | +56,+57 | | |
| Teacher Ethnic Groups | | | | | | | | |
| Anglo | | -20,-24,-25 | | | -37 | | | -89 |
| Black | | | | | -37 | -56,-48 | | |
| Hispanic | | +20 | | | +37,+36 | | | |